

Chapter 9

Report on the MORI Omnibus Survey Test of New Questions

David Gordon and Christina Pantazis

Introduction

In order to pilot and test some of the new concepts and ideas in the proposed Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusion, three question modules were placed in the MORI Omnibus survey. This is a preliminary report on the results and a more detailed analysis will be published elsewhere by the research team. However, the results that can be achieved from an Omnibus survey are more limited than those that would be available from the full Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusion.

The three question modules in the Omnibus survey were designed to test:

- New perception of necessities questions (Q1).
- Time use (Q2).
- Intra household poverty (Q3).

The new perception of necessities questions tested in module Q1 serve to pilot the best questions on perceptions of necessities that have been developed in other European surveys but have never been asked in Britain before. Additionally, a number of the questions were designed to try to detect differences in perception that result from the different impact of poverty and social exclusion on men and women and the old and the young.

The results from module Q1 (see below) showed that a large majority of adults in Britain believe that it is necessary for people to have enough money to participate in social norms as well as to meet their physical needs. A majority of all social groups hold these beliefs. There are however a number of interesting variations in the apparent strength of feeling by socio-demographic group.

Time use studies are relatively underdeveloped in Britain compared with Australia, Canada and many European countries. The module Q2 questions represent the first attempt in Britain to test a simplified set of time use questions that can be used in a general social survey. They are based on the stylised time-activity matrix technique used in the Danish Time and Consumption Project Survey in 1988 (Körmendi, 1990; INSTRAW, 1995)

The results from module Q2 (see below) showed that both men and women in Britain spend on average about 9 hours each day working, either paid or unpaid. Women and men spend on average about 15 hours each day on sleeping, leisure and other activities. However, the pattern of paid work, unpaid work, sleep and leisure activities differs for men and women. Women spend more time doing unpaid work, sleeping and on personal care than men and men spend more time on paid work and leisure activities outside the home than do women.

The final question module (Q3) asked about the things that respondents had gone without in the previous year because of shortage of money. This question was based on the results of the focus group discussions (see Chapter 8) and was primarily intended to tap into the differential experiences of poverty.

The results from module Q3 (see below) showed that a large proportion of British adults had gone without basic necessities at some point during the past year due to a lack of money. Eight percent had gone without food and higher proportions had 'often' or 'sometimes' gone without clothes (44%), shoes (33%) and heating (13%). Similarly, 28% had had to cut back on their use of the telephone and 31% of the population had not been able to fully participate in family and other celebrations because of financial difficulties.

The MORI Omnibus Survey

A nationally representative quota sample of 1,018 adults were interviewed by Computer Aided Personal Interviewing (CAPI), face to face in their homes between 3rd and 6th July 1998. Respondents were selected in 85 Parliamentary Constituencies across Britain by means of a 10 cell quota sampling procedure. The quota used were:

Sex	(Male/Female)
Household Tenure	(Owner occupied, LA/HAT, Other)
Age	(15-24, 25-44, 45+)
Working status	(Full-time, part time/not working)

The resulting sample should be representative of all adults in Britain aged 15+. All results reported below after weighting to correct sampling biases¹. The details of the three question modules were as follows:

Q1) *On this card are a number of different items and activities which relate to our standard of living. Please would you indicate whether the item/activity is either*

A) a necessity which you think ALL ADULTS should be able to afford and which they should not have to do without

or

B) an item which may be desirable but is not a necessity

SHOWCARD

1. Replace or repair broken electrical goods such as refrigerator or washing machine
2. Appropriate clothes to wear for job interviews

¹ Some of the sampling bias resulted from interviewers having to go 'off-quota' because of the 'World Cup effect' e.g. women were much more willing to be interviewed than men in July 1998.

3. All medicines prescribed by your doctor
4. A small amount of money to spend each week on yourself, not on your family
5. Having a daily newspaper
6. Access to the internet
7. Visits to friends or family
8. Going to the pub once a fortnight
9. Attending funerals, weddings, and other occasions
10. Attending church/mosque/synagogue or other places of worship

Q2) *I'd now like to ask you to split the day's 24 hours into certain broad task categories. Please indicate how many hours you think you typically spend on the following activities:*

	On normal week days	At weekends (Saturdays and Sundays together)
1. Paid employment, including any overtime and secondary jobs, transport to and from work		
2. Looking after the home, for example, shopping, cooking, cleaning and laundry		
3. Gardening, DIY, maintenance and repair of the home		
4. Child care, playing, and helping with school work		
5. Care of the elderly/disabled and/or voluntary work		
6. Education, studying, and training (including transport to and from place of study)		
7. Leisure/social life in the home (e.g. watching TV, reading, relaxing, thinking)		
8. Leisure/social life outside the home (e.g. visiting friends, going to the pub, sport)		
9. Sleeping, eating, and personal care (e.g. washing)		
10. Other		
Total	24 hours	48 hours

11. Too time consuming
12. Unable to complete question

INSTRUCTION TO INTERVIEWERS: total MUST add up to 24 hours/ 48 hours, if it does not, then prompt.

Q3) *I'm going to read you a list of things which adults have told us that they sometimes go without when money is tight. I'd like you to tell me how often you **personally** have gone without in the last year because of shortage of money.*

	All year	Often	Sometimes	Never	Not applicable
Clothes					
Shoes					
Food.					
Heating					
Telephoning friends/ family					
Going to celebrations for family and friends, e.g. birthdays					
A hobby or sport					
Going out e.g cinema, with friends					
Visits to the pub					
A holiday					
Cigarettes					

Results from Q1 Module

The 'perception of necessities' questions in module Q1 have never been asked in Britain before. They have been derived from discussions amongst the research team, the focus group discussions or from other 'poverty and social exclusion' surveys in Europe. For example, a 'daily newspaper' has been used in poverty surveys in Ireland and Belgium (Callan, Nolan and Whelan, 1993; Nolan and Whelan, 1996; Van den Bosch, 1998) and 'prescribed medicines' in Vietnam (Davies and Smith, 1998) and Finland (Kangas and Ritakallio, 1998).

Previous poverty surveys that have used this 'consensual' method to measure standard of living have used questions that were specifically designed to try to elicit a broad consensus amongst respondents from different socio-demographic backgrounds. These attempts have been largely successful and surveys in Britain (Mack and Lansley, 1985; Gordon and Pantazis, 1997), Sweden (Halleröd, 1995, 1998) and Belgium (Van den Bosch, 1998) have measured a widespread consensus across society that people should be able to afford the basic necessities of life. For example, the overwhelming majority of all groups of respondents agreed that people in their own societies should be able to adequately heat their homes, clothe and feed themselves and their children, not become socially isolated, etc. This consensus has also been demonstrated to be stable over time in Belgium (Van den Bosch, 1998) (e.g. respondents who consider an item to be a necessity of life are highly likely to still hold that opinion if asked the same question several years later).

The new questions tested in module 1 (Q1) serve a dual purpose. Firstly, they pilot the best questions on perceptions of necessities that have been developed in other European surveys but have never been asked in Britain before. Secondly, some of the

questions have been deliberately designed to try to detect differences in perception that result from the different impact of poverty and social exclusion on men and women and the old and the young. There is now considerable qualitative evidence that in British society men and women often experience poverty and exclusion in different ways (see Chapter 3). However, quantitative poverty surveys have generally failed to detect and measure these differences. One of the aims of the new survey of poverty and social exclusion is to begin to quantify the extent and nature of intra-household poverty and exclusion (e.g. poverty and social exclusion within the household as well as between households).

Similarly, given the increased regionalisation in Europe and the greater autonomy of Scotland and Wales cultural differences in the perceptions of necessities between the populations of England, Scotland and Wales are of growing policy importance.

Table 9.1.1 shows the percent of respondents by sex and age group, who considered these deprivation factors to be necessities of life which all adults in Britain should be able to afford.

Table 9.1.2 shows the results broken down by social class, country and household income.

Table 9.1.1: Percent of population in Britain in 1998 considering item to be a necessity, broken down by sex and age

Question	Total Population	Sex		Age		
		Female	Male	15-29	30 – Pension	Pension Age
All medicines prescribed by your doctor	89	89	88	90	89	86
Replace or repair broken electrical goods	75	82	67	72	74	81
Visits to friends or family	68	70	66	71	66	68
Clothes to wear for job interviews	63	60	65	67	63	58
Attending funerals, weddings, etc.	57	56	59	67	52	55
Small amount of money to spend each week on yourself	48	46	49	44	47	52
Attending church/mosque/synagogue	31	35	26	31	27	38
A daily newspaper	19	19	20	12	16	34
Pub once a fortnight	15	13	16	20	13	12
Access to the internet	3	3	3	5	2	3

Table 9.1.2: Percent of population in Britain in 1998 considering item to be a necessity, broken down by social class, country and household income

Question	Social Class				Country			Household Income		
	AB	C1	C2	DE	England	Scotland	Wales	<17500	17500 - 30000	30000+
All medicines prescribed by your doctor	91	90	87	87	88	96	90	87	91	88
Replace or repair broken electrical goods	74	70	76	80	73	90	90	81	73	73
Visits to friends or family	71	69	65	67	68	68	69	69	67	63
Clothes to wear for job interviews	63	62	62	64	61	73	77	63	59	68
Attending funerals, weddings, etc.	55	59	57	56	57	62	52	58	52	52
Small amount of money to spend each week on yourself	51	45	42	52	46	53	58	49	47	44
Attending church/mosque/synagogue	36	33	24	30	31	33	33	30	25	32
A daily newspaper	16	22	18	21	19	26	17	19	11	12
Pub once a fortnight	15	14	11	17	14	15	31	14	10	14
Access to the internet	2	4	1	4	3	3	2	3	3	1

The first column in Table 9.1.1 shows that 89% of the British population considers that everybody should be able to afford all the medicines prescribed by their doctor. Tables 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 show there is a widespread consensus on the necessity of this across the divisions of British society - across social class, age, gender, income and other groupings.

Consensual poverty surveys in Finland (Kangas and Ritakallio, 1998) and Vietnam (Davies and Smith, 1998) have found that over 90% of respondents consider having required medicines to be a necessity. Gordon and Pantazis (1997) have argued that the relative theory of poverty predicts that if a society gets richer, the number of people who perceive common possessions and activities as necessary will increase. Goods and services that are luxuries at first become generally available as a result of mass production. So it is surprising to find that a greater percentage of the Vietnamese population consider 'all medicines prescribed by their doctor' to be a necessity than do British people. Since Vietnam is a far 'poorer' country than Britain. The explanation for this apparent paradox lies in the greater consequences of not having access to necessary medicines in Vietnam compared with Britain. Lack of access to medicines is a major cause of suffering and premature morbidity and mortality in Vietnam at present. The 1998 World Health Report (WHO, 1998) estimates that only about 50% of the Vietnamese population has 'regular access to essential drugs' compared with almost 100% of the British population. The consequences of not being able to get hold of medicines are more obvious to the average Vietnamese person than to the average Briton.

In addition to all medicines prescribed by your doctor, Table 9.1.1 shows that four other items were considered to be necessities by more than 50% of the British population e.g. replace or repair broken electrical goods; appropriate clothes to wear for job interviews; visits to friends or family and attending funerals, weddings, etc.

These results once again demonstrate that a large majority of the country agrees that it is necessary for people to have enough money to participate in social norms as well as to meet their physical needs. This consensus is attested to by the fact that Tables 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 show that a majority of all social groups consider these items to be necessities. There are however a number of interesting variations in the apparent strength of feeling by socio-demographic group.

Women are more likely than men to consider that replacing or repairing broken electrical goods is a necessity. Conversely, men are more likely than women to consider that having appropriate clothes to wear for job interviews is a necessity. A similar pattern is evident by age group with pensioners attaching greater importance to repairing or replacing broken electrical goods than do young adults under 30. Similarly, adults under 30 are more likely to consider that having appropriate clothes for job interviews is a necessity than do pensioners. Significant differences are also evident by country (Table 9.1.2). People in Scotland are more likely to consider all items to be necessities than do their English counterparts, indicating possible cultural as well as demographic differences in the perception of necessities of life. This issue will be explored in greater detail by the research team elsewhere since, if Scottish people are less tolerant of poverty and social exclusion than people are in England, this may have significant policy implications for expenditure by the Scottish Parliament.

Tables 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 show that five items were not considered to be necessities by a majority of people e.g. a small amount of money to spend each week on yourself, not on your family; having a daily newspaper; access to the internet; going to the pub once a fortnight and attending church/mosque/synagogue or other places of worship. The consensual method (*Breadline Britain*) of measuring poverty requires that questions on necessities be asked that elicit the whole range of opinion. The ten new questions tested in question module 1 (Q1) appear to have been very successful in achieving this desired aim, with opinions ranging from 89% of the population considering all medicines prescribed by the doctor to be a necessity to only 3% of the population considering access to the internet to be necessary.

It is interesting to note that so few people consider access to the internet and having a daily newspaper to be necessary given academic and political concern over the advent of the 'information society' and debates on the growth of the 'information rich' and the 'information poor'. In fact, the only 'information' sources that a majority of the British population probably consider to be necessities at present are contact with friends and family, television and telephones. The importance that people place on public sources of information such as the newspapers, televisions and the internet might be inversely related to their degree of social contact and the size of their social networks. Almost three times as many pensioners (34%) as adults under 30 (12%) consider that having a daily newspaper is a necessity. The proposed survey on Poverty and Social Exclusion should be able to shed new light on this question.

Results from the Q2 (Time Use) module

Given the importance of how people spend their time, there is an extraordinary lack of information on the time use of adults in Britain. Time use data are needed to produce accurate national accounts which include measures of the unpaid work and the hidden economy (Neuburger, 1996) and they are essential for policy making purposes with regard to care of children, the elderly and disabled people and the voluntary sector. Unless we know how much work is being done in these areas, it is difficult to arrive at sensible evidence based policies. Time use data are also necessary for addressing ongoing debates about time poverty (for example, see discussion in Gordon, 1995). We simply do not know at present whether 'poor' people also suffer from 'time' poverty or whether time weighs heavily on their hands compared to the rest of the population. Do the 'poor' do more work or less than the majority? Are there large variations in the amount of 'time' stress that different groups of 'poor' people suffer from? e.g. lone parents compared with the working poor.

In order to provide answers to these important questions, a simple survey device is needed to accurately measure the major components of time use. Unfortunately, Britain has never had an official time use survey although one is currently in preparation by the Office for National Statistics and SCPR. All previous British time use surveys have been small scale and carried out by organisations like the BBC and the ESRC². These have been dedicated time use surveys which have collected only very limited additional socio-economic and demographic information. They have adopted internationally approved detailed time diary and time budget methodologies (Harvey, 1993). Although accurate at the population level, these are complex and time-consuming survey instruments which often require multiple visits by an interviewer and often only produce information at the individual level on one days time use. Therefore, these methods are not suitable for a survey which wants to address issues of time poverty as well as other forms of social exclusion and poverty – for this a simpler, less time consuming survey instrument is necessary.

The module Q2 questions are based on the stylised time-activity matrix technique used in the Danish Time and Consumption Project Survey in 1988 (Körmendi, 1990; INSTRAW, 1995). Comparisons of the results obtained from stylised time use questions compared with full time use diaries in Canada (Paille, 1994) and Denmark (Körmendi, 1990) has indicated that the only major significant differences in the results are that stylised time matrices yield greater estimates for the amount of time spent on child care (in both Canada and Denmark) and DIY (in Denmark).

These differences arise, in part, because of the different ideologies of the two methods. Time diaries allow people to record secondary activities whereas stylised time use matrices do not. Many respondents will record childcare activities as a secondary activity in time diaries but will count childcare as the most important activity when faced with a stylised time use matrix. Whether or not this is problematic depends on the importance researchers place on childcare activities (and other unpaid work activities).

² Some limited data on time use are available from the BHPS which contains questions on time spent on paid work and time spent on housework in the average week.

The results from the time use matrix question (Q2) are shown in Tables 9.2.1 and 9.2.2.

Table 9.2.1: Time use by adults in Britain in 1998 on normal weekdays and at weekends

	On normal weekdays <i>(N=865)</i>	At weekends (Saturdays and Sundays together) <i>(N=745)</i>
1. Paid employment, including any overtime and secondary jobs, transport to and from work	4h 27min	2h 55min
2. Looking after the home, for example, shopping, cooking, cleaning and laundry	2h 21min	4h 41min
3. Gardening, DIY, maintenance and repair of the home	0h 51min	2h 25min
4. Child care, playing, and helping with school work	1h 4min	2h 42min
5. Care of the elderly/disabled and/or voluntary work	0h 17min	0h 35min
6. Education, studying, and training (including transport to and from place of study)	0h 38min	0h 50min
7. Leisure/social life in the home (e.g. watching TV, reading, relaxing, thinking)	3h 28min	7h 56min
8. Leisure/social life outside the home (e.g. visiting friends, going to the pub, sport)	1h 36min	6h 0min
9. Sleeping, eating, and personal care (e.g. washing)	8h 32min	17h 49min
10. Other	0h 46min	2h 7min
Total	24 hours (1440 min)	48 hours (2880 min)

Table 9.2.1 shows the average time spent engaged in ten different activities on normal weekdays and on weekends. Using the European Statistical Office's (Eurostat) definition of paid work, unpaid work and leisure, all time recorded as item 1 is paid work, all time recorded under items 2 to 6 are unpaid work and time recorded under items 7 to 9 are leisure (Niemi, n.d.). After data cleaning to remove outliers, 865 respondents gave valid responses to the weekday stylised time use matrix question (e.g. a 84% response rate) and 745 respondents were able to fill the weekend matrix (e.g. a 72% response rate).

Table 9.2.1 shows that, on normal weekdays, British adults spend on average 4 hours 27 minutes on paid work, 5 hours 11 minutes doing unpaid work and 14 hours 22 minutes engaged in leisure, sleeping and other activities. On weekends, British adults spend on average 2 hours 55 minutes on paid work, 11 hours 13 minutes on unpaid work and 33 hours 52 minutes on sleeping, leisure and other activities.

Table 9.2.2: Average daily time use (weekdays and weekends combined) by adults in Britain in 1998 by sex

	Female (<i>N</i> =372)	Male (<i>N</i> =368)
1. Paid employment, including any overtime and secondary jobs, transport to and from work	2h 38min	4h 44min
2. Looking after the home, for example, shopping, cooking, cleaning and laundry	3h 6min	1h 30min
3. Gardening, DIY, maintenance and repair of the home	49min	1h 5min
4. Child care, playing, and helping with school work	1h 37min	41min
5. Care of the elderly/disabled and/or voluntary work	16min	16min
6. Education, studying, and training (including transport to and from place of study)	28min	40min
7. Leisure/social life in the home (e.g. watching TV, reading, relaxing, thinking)	3h 32min	3h 38min
8. Leisure/social life outside the home (e.g. visiting friends, going to the pub, sport)	1h 48min	2h 12min
9. Sleeping, eating, and personal care (e.g. washing)	8h 53min	8h 28min
10. Other	53min	45min
Total	24 hours (1440 min)	24 hours (1440 min)

Table 9.2.2 shows the average amount of time men and women spend on different activities in a day. This is calculated by multiplying the results for normal weekdays by five and adding them to the weekend results before dividing by seven. This is therefore a rather artificial construct since, as Table 9.2.1 has shown, people spend their time very differently on weekdays compared to weekends (particularly, if they are employed). Nobody actually spends their day as shown in Table 9.2.2 but it is a useful way of visualising differences in time use by gender.

Men on average spend 4 hours 44 minutes engaged in paid employment each day compared with women who on average only spend 2 hours 38 minutes doing paid work. By contrast, men spend 4 hours 12 minutes doing unpaid work compared with 6 hours 16 minutes of unpaid work done by women. It seems that both men and women in Britain spend on average about 9 hours each day working, either paid or unpaid. Both women and men spend on average about 15 hours each day on sleeping, leisure and other activities. However, the pattern of sleep and leisure activities differs for men and women. Women spend more time sleeping and on personal care than men and men spend more time on leisure activities outside the home than do women.

Table 9.2.3: Time use by adults aged 20-60 in the UK - comparison of the Stylised Time Activity Matrix results from the MORI Omnibus Survey with those from other UK Diary Based Time Use Surveys

Activity in minutes per day	BBC 1961	BBC 1974/75	ESRC 1983- 1987	ONS 1995	MORI Omnibus 1998
Personal care and domestic work	814	795	805	804	802
Paid work	316	305	267	291	292
Caring	14	12	23	18	14
Leisure in the home	214	204	221	215	224
Leisure outside the home	82	125	125	113	107

One of the major reasons for piloting the stylised time use matrix question (Q2) was to test if it would yield reliable results. Many respondents had difficulty in answering this question and a number of the MORI interviewers commented that they were concerned about the accuracy of some respondents answers to this question. Table 9.2.3 compares the results from the 1998 MORI Omnibus pilot of the stylised time use matrix question with those from other UK and British time diary and time budget surveys over the past 37 years. In order to try to achieve comparability, the results have been calculated in five broad categories: personal care and domestic work, paid work, caring, leisure in the home and leisure outside the home. The results shown in Table 9.2.3 have been recalculated from Gershuny and Smith (1995) and they show a remarkably high level of correspondence between the stylised time use matrix results and those from more complex time diary surveys for adults in the 20 to 60 age group.

Although there is a remarkable degree of correspondence when comparing broad categories of time use, significant differences remain when comparing smaller subdivisions of time. In particular, the stylised time use matrix recorded that both men and women spent more time engaged in child care and DIY/gardening than did the 1995 UK time budget study by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) (Gershuny and Smith, 1995). The MORI survey recorded that men spent on average 41 minutes on child care and 1 hour 5 minutes on DIY/gardening (see Table 9.2.2) compared with 17 minutes on child care and 54 minutes on DIY/gardening in the 1995 ONS survey. Similarly, women spent on average 1 hour 37 minutes on childcare and 49 minutes on DIY/gardening in the MORI survey and only 40 minutes on childcare and 26 minutes on DIY/gardening in the 1995 ONS survey.

These differences between the results for stylised time use matrix questions and time diaries in Britain are similar to those found in Canada and Denmark (INSTRAW, 1995). As previously discussed, the childcare differences arise at least in part from the ideological differences between these two methods. It is possible that, if the importance of childcare was stressed in the instructions given to participants in time diary studies, then the amount of time recorded spent on childcare as a primary activity would increase. Men and women spend a lot of their time doing several different things at once and what is recorded as the most important activity depends on the methods used. There seems no reason to believe that the results from time

diaries on childcare and DIY/gardening time use are preferable to those from stylised time use matrices such as question module 2.

Results from the Q3 (going without) module.

The final MORI test question asked the population about the items that they have gone without in the previous year because of shortage of money. This question was devised for the focus group discussions and it was primarily intended to tap into the differential experiences of poverty. Feminist research has highlighted how poverty is a gendered experience, and one important element to this is that men and women may each behave differently in times of shortage, with women in particular being more likely to go without certain necessities in order that the household's needs are met (Charles and Kerr, 1987; Craig and Glendinning, 1990).

Table 9.3.1 below shows the percent of the population going without certain necessities (e.g. food, clothes, heating) and other items (e.g. hobby, visits to the pub, cigarettes) in the past year because of shortage of money. Eight percent of the population 'often' or 'sometimes' go without food. Unsurprisingly, higher proportions of the population go without clothes (44%), shoes (33%) and heating (13%) either 'often' or 'sometimes', whilst 28% and 31% of the population goes without using the telephone and family and other celebrations, respectively. An interesting observation to be made is that, in times of hardship, maintaining social contacts through use of the telephone or participating in celebrations appears to be more important than necessities such as clothes and shoes. This finding supports other studies that show that, when there is a drastic cut in resources, people sometimes act to fulfil their social obligations before they act to satisfy their physical wants. They require income to fulfil their various roles and participate in the social customs and associations to which they have become habituated and not only to satisfy their physical wants (Townsend and Gordon, 1989).

Table 9.3.1: Percent of respondents who have gone without various items during the past year because of shortage of money

	All Year	Often	Sometimes	Never	N/A
Clothes	2	13	28	56	2
Shoes	1	9	21	67	2
Food	-	1	6	92	1
Heating	-	2	9	87	2
Telephoning friends/ family	1	5	19	72	3
Going to celebrations for family and friends, e.g. birthdays	-	5	22	69	4
A hobby or sport	2	6	23	55	14
Going out e.g. cinema, with friends	1	9	26	49	15
Visits to the pub	1	10	23	38	28

A holiday	10	12	24	47	7
Cigarettes	-	4	8	25	63

Table 9.3.2 below demonstrates how gender and age might mediate the experience of going without in times of shortage of money. The results for gender reveal that similar proportions of women and men go without most items either ‘all year’ or ‘often’ because of shortage of money. Where discrepancies do exist (e.g. clothes, shoes, holidays), women are invariably more likely than men to go without. Age appears to be a more important factor in illuminating differences in the experiences of poverty. The experiences of going without certain items are quite pronounced when comparing the youngest (15-29) with the eldest population groups (pensionable age). Young people are four times more likely than the elderly to say that they have gone without clothes ‘all year’ or ‘often’ because of a shortage on money. Indeed, excluding food and heating where the numbers are too small to be meaningful, young people are more likely to say that they have gone without items due a shortage of money.

Table 9.3.2: Percent of respondents who have gone without various items ‘all year’ or ‘often’ during the past year by sex and age group

Question	Total Population	Sex		Age		
		Female	Male	15-29	30 – Pension	Pension Age
Clothes	14	19	7	20	16	4
Shoes	10	13	6	15	11	3
Food.	1	1	-	1	1	-
Heating	2	3	1	2	1	-
Telephoning friends/ family	6	7	5	6	7	2
Going to celebrations for family and friends, e.g. birthdays	6	6	5	13	4	1
A hobby or sport	8	8	6	8	9	4
Going out e.g. cinema, with friends	10	10	11	17	11	2
Visits to the pub	11	11	11	17	11	3
A holiday	22	26	19	33	22	10
Cigarettes	4	5	3	6	4	2

People from different parts of Britain are also likely to experience poverty differently. Table 9.3.3 below shows that the English are more likely to go without clothes, shoes and heating than either the Welsh or the Scottish due to shortage of money. Approximately equal proportions give up going out either to the cinema or the pub. This suggests that the Welsh and the Scottish are less likely to cut back on material necessities in times of financial hardship and this may be connected to the poorer weather conditions they experience. Conversely, the Scottish and the Welsh appear to be more likely than the English to cut back on social necessities (such as going to celebrations, out with friends, etc.) in times of hardship.

Table 9.3.3 (overleaf) also shows the expected pattern of going without by social class and household income. The lower the social class or household income the more likely the respondent is to have gone without all items during the past year.

Table 9.3.3: Percent of respondents who have gone without various items ‘all year’ or ‘often’ during the past year by social class, country and household income

Item	Social Class				Country			Household Income		
	AB	C1	C2	DE	England	Scotland	Wales	<17500	17500-30000	30000+
Clothes	9	12	14	20	15	7	8	19	17	10
Shoes	5	9	9	16	11	4	4	16	9	8
Food.	-	1	-	2	1	2	-	2	-	-
Heating	1	3	2	2	2	1	-	3	-	-
Telephoning friends/family	2	4	5	10	6	7	2	8	2	3
Going to celebrations for family and friends, e.g. birthdays	1	6	6	8	5	7	8	10	8	3
A hobby or sport	4	8	10	8	8	6	11	10	9	8
Going out e.g. cinema, with friends	7	11	9	14	10	10	11	14	13	10
Visits to the pub	8	9	11	13	11	12	13	14	14	11
A holiday	11	18	20	35	21	24	34	29	25	17
Cigarettes	2	2	5	7	4	3	10	6	6	4

References

- Andreß, H.J. (Ed.) (1998) *Empirical Poverty Research in a Comparative Perspective*. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Callan, T., Nolan, B. and Whelan, C.T. (1993) Resources, Deprivation and the Measurement of Poverty, *Journal of Social Policy*, 22(2), 141-172.
- Charles, N. and Kerr, M. (1987) Just the way it is: Gender and age differences in family food assumption, In Brannen, J. and Wilson, G. (Eds.) *Give and Take in Families: Studies in resource distribution*, London, Allen & Unwin.
- Craig, G. and Glendinning, C. (1990) Parenting in Poverty. *Community Care*, 24(7), 24-25.
- Davies, R. and Smith, W. (1998) *The Basic Necessities Survey: The Experience of Action Aid Vietnam*. London, Action Aid.
- Gordon, D. (1995) Census Based Deprivation Indices: Their Weighting and Validation. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*. 49 (Suppl 2), S39-S44.
- Gordon, D. and Pantazis, C. (Eds.) (1997) *Breadline Britain in the 1990s*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Gershuny, J. and Smith, R. (1995) *Report to the Central Statistical Office on the Development of a Simple Time Diary Schedule*. ESRC Research Centre on Microsocial Change, Essex University.

- Halleröd, B. (1995) The Truly Poor: Indirect and Direct Measurement of Consensual Poverty in Sweden, *Journal of European Social Policy*, 5(2), 111-29.
- Halleröd, B. (1998) Poor Swedes, Poor Britons: A Comparative Analysis of Relative Deprivation, In Andreß, H.J. (Ed.) *Empirical Poverty Research in a comparative Perspective*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Harvey, A.S. (1993) Guidelines for Time Use Data Collection. *Social Indicators Research*, 30, 197-228.
- INSTRAW (1995) *Measurement and Valuation of Unpaid Contribution: Accounting Through Time and Output*. INSTRAW, Santo Domingo, Dominica Republic.
- Kangas, O. and Ritakallio, V.M. (1998) Different methods – different results? Approaches to multidimensional poverty, In Andreß, H.J. (Ed.) *Empirical Poverty Research in a comparative Perspective*, , Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Körmendi, E. (1990) Time use in the late 1980s: Two different measurements, In Morgensen, G.V. (Ed.) *Time and Consumption: Time use and consumption in Denmark in recent decades*. (pp. 163-184), Copenhagen, Danmarks Statistik.
- Mack, J. and Lansley, S. (1985) *Poor Britain*. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Neuburger, H. (1996) Time use from a National Accounts perspective. *Economic trends*, 513, 19-22.
- Niemi, I. (n.d.) *European Time Use Survey: Proposal for the Diary Coding*. Luxembourg, Eurostat.
- Nolan, B. and Whelan, C.T. (1996) *Resources, Deprivation and Poverty*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Paille, B. (1994) *Estimating the volume of unpaid activities in Canada, 1992: An evaluation of data from the General Social Survey*. General Social Survey Working Paper 10, Ottawa, Statistics Canada.
- Townsend, P. and Gordon, D. (1989) Low Income Households, *Memorandum of Evidence to the House of Commons Social Services Committee*, 579, 45-73. (Also published as Townsend, P. and Gordon, D. (1991) What is Enough? New Evidence on Poverty Allowing the Definition of a Minimum Benefit, In Alder, M., Bell C., Clasen, J. and Sinfield, A. (Eds.) *The Sociology of Social Security*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp35-69.)
- Van den Bosch, K. (1998) Perceptions of the minimum standard of living in Belgium: Is there a consensus? In Andreß, H.J. (Ed.) *Empirical Poverty Research in a comparative Perspective*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- WHO (1998) *The World Health Report 1998: Life in the 21st Century A Vision for all*, Geneva, WHO.